

REMARKS

In the June 3, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-22 were pending in the application; rejected claims 1-3, 9-17, 19, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and rejected claims 4-8, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In rejecting the claims, U.S. Patent 5,581,691 to Hsu et al. (Reference A) was cited. Claim 23 has been added and thus, claims 1-23 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Prior Art Rejections

In items 4-12 on pages 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 9-17, 19, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,581,691 to Hsu et al. In items 14-23 on pages 5-7 of the Office Action, claims 4-8, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hsu et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "association information ... associates the process executed by the process executing device with the process executed by the other process executing device based on a correspondence relation between the process executing data and the process executed by the other process executing device" (claim 1, last four lines), using wording similar to that in claim 10 as filed. On the other hand, Hsu et al. discloses managing "predefined" work flows (column 5, lines 10-12). Nothing has been cited or found in Hsu et al. regarding any way to create work flows, just copies or "instances" of predefined work flows. As a result, Hsu et al. does not teach or suggest any way of associating the process executed by the process executing device with the process executed by the other of the process executing devices. For the above reasons, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hsu et al.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore, claims 2-11 patentably distinguish over Hsu et al. for at least the same reasons that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Hsu et al. The other independent claims have been amended to recite limitations similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 12, 15-17, 19, 21 and 22 and claims 13, 14, 18 and 20 which depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over Hsu et al.

New Claim 23

Claim 23 has been added to recite the invention with varying scope. Claim 23 recites "interprocess association information associating first and second processes respectively executed by the processor and the external device based on a correspondence relation between

the second process and process executing data of the first process" (claim 23, lines 3-6) and therefore patentably distinguishes over Hsu et al. for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Summary

It is submitted that Hsu et al. does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-23 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

9/3/04

By: _____

Richard A. Gollhofer

Richard A. Gollhofer

Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501